

SEEKING PUBLIC INPUT FOR THE FUTURE OF SEQUOIA & KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARKS

General Management Plan • Newsletter 2 • Summer 1998

Dear Friends,

In May 1998 we finished the scoping phase of the general management planning process for Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. Thank you for participating in the process by sharing your visions for the parks' future. While this phase lasted longer than expected, your comments and insights helped to clarify the issues and made us aware of your views and concerns.

Since we began the planning process in the summer of 1997, several things occurred that affected the schedule for the project. Funding for all planning projects was reduced, and scoping indicated a depth of controversy about some issues that will require additional attention and time. We anticipate finalizing the plan in 2001. As we go into the next planning phase, there are three points that I would like to emphasize.

- First, there are no alternatives yet. Although management proposals have been presented in past planning documents, the general management plan (GMP) process presents an opportunity to look at issues with fresh eyes. We will start developing a range of alternatives this fall. The alternatives will explore the highest and best use of all areas in the parks. You can participate in the process by attending workshops or by completing an alternatives workbook. The dates and locations of these workshops are listed on the back of this newsletter. Other planning activities are summarized on page 11.
- Second, scoping and planning are not a voting process. The purpose of scoping is to ensure that all issues and interests have surfaced and that we understand the differences in viewpoints.
- Third, planning often requires tough decisions. It is the National Park Service's responsibility to use a process and a forum that permit issues to be openly aired, disparate views to be considered, and solutions to be publicly evaluated. It is also the Park Service's responsibility to ensure the exploration of a full range of reasonable alternatives. With the differing viewpoints expressed thus far, some alternatives developed during the process will not please everyone.

Our recent scoping activities generated a large volume of issues, which have now been consolidated into seven major topics. This newsletter summarizes the scoping process and presents an overview of the issues. A third newsletter in the early fall will continue the overview. A workbook/newsletter, designed to help develop alternatives, will be mailed out in November. The newsletters will also be posted on our park and NPS internet web sites.

The scoping showed that there is much consensus about the future direction for these parks — people generally like the parks the way they are and were, and they want them protected from degradation. Differences of opinion were also expressed. One area of great controversy is the management of the Mineral King area. The intensity of feelings and the divergence of opinions on this issue will require increased public involvement so that the Park Service can provide updates on the issue and on the progress being made in developing alternatives for this area. Other issues with divergent viewpoints include appropriate uses in designated wilderness zones and the parks' fire management policy. A wilderness management plan (WMP) and a fire management plan (FMP) are underway. These plans should resolve these controversies by providing details on implementing specific management actions. They are scheduled to be completed before the general management plan is finished. Because of this, relevant public input provided to the overall GMP process will be shared with these projects. The schedule for these planning efforts has been added to the timeline on page 11. You can request that your name be placed on the mailing list for these efforts by contacting the parks' public information officer (see page 9).

Sequoia and Kings Canyon remain significant "crown jewels" in the national park system. The ongoing planning will ensure that the resources and the park experiences that are so highly valued will be there for future generations. I look forward to your continued participation.

Michael Tollefson, Superintendent

The Process

Newsletter 1 (summer 1997) outlined the purpose and significance of the parks and summarized 17 issues in which the public had expressed interest. The newsletter also included a comment form requesting feedback. *Newsletter 1* was distributed to our mailing list, which now includes around 1,850 individuals and organizations. Copies were also made available to individuals making requests over the telephone or by mail. Finally, the newsletter was posted in the parks' internet home page and the NPS planning home page.

The issues and information presented in our first newsletter attracted considerable attention. In addition to the feedback forms, we also received numerous telephone contacts, public input at open houses, letters, and form letters. In total we received over 600 written responses from private individuals, advocacy groups, and federal, state, and local agencies.

Grouping Issues

The comments generated by the first newsletter helped identify numerous new or related issues not originally described. By the end of the scoping phase, the number of issues grew from 17 to over 50. Assessing more than 50 separate issues quickly became unwieldy. To facilitate future discussions, the issues were grouped into the seven following categories. Examples of issues are listed under each category for illustration.

OVERALL PARK CHARACTER

- developed area identity and “feel”
- desired park image
- park design
- value for the public — balancing costs, maintainability, and quality

RESOURCE PROTECTION

Natural Resources

- ecosystem management of different landscape types (foothills, forests, sequoia groves, and alpine areas)
- wild and scenic rivers designations
- air and water quality
- threatened and endangered species (bighorn sheep and trout species)
- wilderness areas
- fire management
- bear management
- invasive nonnative plants
- ecosystem carrying capacity

Cultural Resources

- evaluation and management of historically significant resources
- NPS preservation requirements and responsibilities
- park history
- future management of Mineral King
- impacts of management policy on fee simple properties such as Wilsonia and Silver City
- loss of resources

PROVIDING ENJOYMENT

- visitor activities and educational opportunities
- visitor expectations (solitude and opportunities for self-reliance, nonurban experiences)
- permit systems and visitor use rules
- year-round visitor opportunities
- visitor services and facilities — amount/quantity
- noise

- lines, delays, and waiting
- personal freedoms
- appropriate additional visitor activities (mountain biking, use of pack animals, ice skating, downhill skiing, snowmobiling)

PARK USERS

- visitor carrying capacity / park crowding
- visitor demographics
- regional population growth
- accessibility for all users regardless of age, physical, mental, or emotional ability

TRANSPORTATION

- transportation system(s) — current and future
- road capacities and conditions
- desired character of roads
- limits on transportation use to improve parking conditions and to reduce traffic congestion (the size and types of vehicles permitted)
- support services (gas and service stations, information and warning signs)
- parking availability

PARK OPERATIONS

- maintenance, staffing, and facilities (utility systems, visitor facilities, support facilities, employee housing)
- user fees (entrances and campgrounds)
- concession operations and facilities
- partnerships (cooperating associations, user groups, Southern California Edison)
- trail maintenance (frontcountry and backcountry/wilderness)
- services (desired numbers of showers, picnic areas, bear-proof food lockers, parking lots, bike trails, campgrounds improvements)
- open hours for facilities

I

PARK CONTEXT

- ecosystem management of resources
- regional planning
- coordinating with adjoining federal land uses
- opportunities to manage federal lands differently
- working with gateway communities
- regional air quality

Newsletter I generated a healthy range of responses. Viewpoints varied from a general consensus on some topics to highly divergent opinions on others. *The following summarizes what we heard from you. . . .*

Mission of the Parks

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE

While most commenters agree with the parks' purpose and significance statements, there are some comments and recommendations about specific wording that will be used to refine these statements. For example, some people wonder how "appropriate use" is determined. In the next newsletter you will find an updated statement of purpose and significance.

VISION FOR THE PARKS

"Keep the Parks as They Are!"

National parks evoke nostalgia and happy memories. The vast majority of respondents have views and visions that would preserve these memories:

- Protect the natural resources for the future while improving resource conditions (if possible).
- Identify and protect cultural resources as part of our human heritage.
- Provide opportunities for visitor enjoyment that are similar to what exist today; reestablish some things from the past.
- Don't let the parks get overcrowded.

People generally accept placing limitations on visitor use as a way to accomplish these goals. There are, however, a few opposing views.

Vision vs. Reality

The nostalgic conditions envisioned for the park may reflect a desire for simpler times — times with easy, clear-cut decisions and without major societal challenges. But the parks, now over a century old, are not protected islands. Instead, they are part of natural and cultural systems that constantly evolve. More importantly, significant change often comes from outside the park:

- Changing values of park visitors and the general population place new demands on park services.
- Rapid regional population growth and shifting demographics create new pressure for more facility development.
- Air pollution from outside the parks degrades park vegetation and vistas.
- New standards for underground gasoline storage affect fuel availability in the parks.
- Legal requirements regulate accessibility, clean air, water, and threatened and endangered species.
- Affordable personal transportation makes it increasingly easy for more people to visit the parks.
- Large vehicles and buses create pressure for different road conditions.
- Aging populations, year-round schools, and evolving recreation trends mean increased numbers of people want to visit throughout the year.

Resolving the difference between the desired vision and reality requires careful thought. We cannot keep the parks as they are today without taking specific and often difficult actions to limit growth. Some issues may require a level of planning and detail that are outside the scope of the GMP process or that may not affect the process. Additionally, divergent viewpoints mean some users are likely to feel that the plan hurts them or unfairly limits their use of the parks. This is a reality that points out the important responsibility that the National Park Service has to use a reasonable, sensible approach in planning.

Comment Topics

Issues that received the most interest and comment are discussed and summarized below. Comments related to these and other issues will also be discussed and summarized in the next newsletter.

RESOURCE PROTECTION — NATURAL RESOURCES

Air Quality

Public Viewpoints: Many respondents feel that air quality is a prime concern, not just because of impacts to resources and vistas, but because it indicates larger challenges facing society and it affects everyone's health. Along with this concern is a feeling of helplessness about what can be done to control the effects of pollution on the parks. Regional planning and regional controls are seen as ways to minimize adverse impacts on the parks.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Public Viewpoints: Several commenters want portions of the Kaweah and Kern Rivers to be designated as wild and scenic. The commenting public clearly values and wants protection for the free-flowing and wild rivers of the parks.

RESOURCE PROTECTION — CULTURAL RESOURCES

Mineral King

The Controversy: The scoping process confirmed that considerable controversy surrounds two interrelated aspects in the Mineral King area of Sequoia National Park — *permit cabins* and *cultural resources*.

- The users of permitted cabins on public land inside the park desire to extend permit uses beyond the statutory limits.
- Some of the cabins are over 50 years old, which makes them potential cultural resources that may be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

The issues are (1) whether the cabin permits should be extended and (2) how to manage potential cultural resources.

These factors lead to competing views. All sides have much at stake, and the issues have larger ramifications for the National Park Service. *It is extremely important that issues of this magnitude be dealt with in a general management plan, in fact, this is the responsibility of the National Park Service. The GMP process will allow the Mineral King cabin permit and cultural resource issues to have full public exploration of the ramifications.*

Background on the Permit Controversy — This issue has been described by some permittees as a property rights issue, but the land in question has always belonged to the public. The Mineral King Valley, surrounded by Sequoia National Park since 1926, was transferred to the National Park Service in 1978 after a contentious battle over U.S. Forest Service (USFS) plans to develop a downhill ski resort in the area. At that time there were about 60 special use permit cabins on public land in addition to privately owned mining and other land in the area — much of which has since been acquired by the park.

In the transfer legislation, Congress set expiration limits for the cabin permits and restricted permits to holders of record in 1978. With the expiration of a permit, the law requires that the cabins be removed, ultimately providing public access to the entire area. The legislation also prohibits the development of downhill skiing. This law currently directs the management policy for the area.

The NPS special use permit system requires the permittees to pay a nominal annual fee. The permits may be renewed every 5 years for the life of the permittee of record. Permits cannot be sold, deeded, transferred, or inherited. The cabin permit holders very naturally see this as resulting in a future loss of use and the destruction of their recreational community.

An area plan was developed in 1980, but the plan could never be fully implemented during the tenure of the cabin permits. The 1980 plan will be superseded by the general management plan under development. The GMP alternatives for the future management of this area will be developed with public input beginning later this year. *Public Viewpoints:* As a group the permit holders want to extend cabin permits as well as to acquire the rights to transfer permits to their heirs. Since many families have held permits for generations, the issue is highly emotional. The permit holders have formed several organizations that seek to change of NPS policy and present laws or the law transferring Mineral King to Sequoia National Park. Many of the permit holders contend that the limitations placed on the cabin permits were hastily added to the legislation and were unfair. They identify themselves as good stewards of the public land and a living historic community. They propose various partnerships with National Park Service and have proposed several pieces of legislation to Congress.

Not surprisingly many others have an opposing view. They contend the original agreement in the transfer law was fair and allowed adequate time, since at the point of transfer to Sequoia only a final, single year continuation was being issued by the Forest Service. Holders of this viewpoint say that the cabins should be removed for the benefit of the greater public. They feel that extending permit use amounts to the appropriation of public land by a privileged or lucky few. They also point out that the cost of the annual permit is less than the cost of a campsite for the season at the daily rate. They note that some private lots still exist in the area that could be purchased by the permit holders. Further, they question whether continuing to issue cabin permits is in the best interest of the public.

History of Mineral King

The Mineral King area was used by Native Americans well before Euro-Americans discovered the area in 1862. Originally thinking the area had potential, early miners and local mining interests named it Mineral King. In 1879 a wagon road was constructed to provide access to the area — the same less-than-two-lane dirt road that currently provides access to the area.

In their heyday the mining communities in the valley boasted some 600 structures. But numerous unsuccessful attempts at mining and the avalanche-prone nature of the area led to the valley's demise as a mining interest. Eventually, Mineral King evolved into a recreation community where local residents could escape the summer valley heat. Various hotels and stores were present at different times, with the still privately owned Silver City, located in the woods below the alpine valley, being the earliest.

A small recreational community composed of USFS permit cabin sites began to take hold early in the 1900s. The area was stocked with game fish, and small dams were developed as part of a local hydroelectric facility. The area was designated a game refuge in 1926.

By 1946 downhill ski proposals emerged, which were initially supported by the Sierra Club. By 1965 the Sierra Club's viewpoint changed due to the enlarged scale of the proposed ski development. The Sierra Club fought a long and successful campaign to include the area in Sequoia National Park, where it would be protected from development. The transfer took place in 1978. During the turbulent 60s and 70s, the area received so much media attention that the resulting visitor overuse caused damage to the fragile alpine environment and meadows — factors that eventually led to the closure of several campgrounds in sensitive areas by the U.S. Forest Service.

Ramifications to the National Park Service: Private use on public park land illustrates a built-in conflict with the National Park Service goal to set aside land for public use and preservation. The idea of national parks is a major American cultural contribution to the world, which is much valued and copied. The public expects equitable access to and use of public land. The continuation of private permit uses on park land also conflicts with NPS policy. Currently, there are over 1,400 special use permits in the national park system. The management of all these permits is guided by NPS-53, Special Park Uses, appendix 22 (December 1997), which prohibits the extension of terms for permits beyond the life estates.

Mineral King Cultural Resource Potential: A second issue involving Mineral King deals with how to manage potential historic resources such as cabins.

Since many of the cabins are older than 50 years, they may be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. To be eligible the resource must have integrity and must

- a) be associated with events making a significant contribution to broad patterns of our history
- b) be associated with an important individual(s)
- c) possess characteristics that embody a distinctive type, period, or method of construction, and/or
- d) possess the ability to shed scientific knowledge or information

Resources may be determined significant at the local, regional, or national level. The Mineral King Preservation Society, representing the cabin permit holders, has submitted a nomination for the "Mineral King Historic Cabin District." The nomination for the permit cabins identifies significance at the local level under criteria a and c, citing that it is representative of a domestic recreational landscape of rustic, vernacular mountain architecture.

YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT . . .

Not every newsletter will contain a response form, but we will welcome your ideas and comments throughout the process. The [project schedule](#) contains information and other topics of interest.

The management of cultural resources depends on their value to the park system and would comply with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Structures and features designated as cultural resources in the Mineral King area would receive the same level of consideration that other already designated resources receive. *Note: NPS policy does not compel a specific level of preservation for historic structures and features. Instead it allows a variety of management techniques that range from costly methods such as reconstruction to documenting structures through drawings and photographs and removing them or permitting them to naturally deteriorate.*

Public Viewpoints: The Mineral King Preservation Society and the Mineral King District Association have stated that they want the area to be managed as a “living community.” They feel that the expiration of legislated permits would destroy valuable resources and a way of life. They feel that the area should be managed separately from the rest of Sequoia National Park, with the extension of current permits and the ability to transfer title as a means to ensure that the community continues. Other commenters see this as continuing a privilege for a small number of individuals under the guise of historic preservation. Ecological restoration of this area is also a goal for many users.

Cultural Resource Ramifications. The application of both the National Historic Preservation Act and the current law poses dilemmas. The law requires cabin removal, which from a historic preservation standpoint, could result in what is known as an adverse effect on those potential resources. Throughout the national park system, there are innumerable historic resources of high-value to small groups. In times of limited resources it is vital and responsible for the National Park Service to evaluate and develop plans to manage existing and potential resources in a wise and cost-effective manner.

SPECIAL STUDY . . .

This summer the National Park Service will complete a “determination of eligibility” study that will evaluate all the historic aspects of the Mineral King area and make any appropriate nominations to the national register. The Mineral King Preservation Society’s national register nomination for the cabin district will provide a good basis for the broader study being conducted by the Park Service. This broader study was recommended by both the Mineral King Preservation Society and Mineral King District Association.

PROVIDING ENJOYMENT

Visitor Experiences

***Public Viewpoints:* Many respondents express an appreciation for the variety of trails and experiences available in the parks. They also value the opportunity to explore the diversity of ecosystems in the parks — from the sequoia groves to the river canyons and from the foothills to the high country. There is broad support for maintaining the less crowded experiences, which draw many of the users. People often identify with specific developed areas and want to retain or return the character of them. Limited facilities are favored, with the need for improved campground showers and more bear-proof food lockers being voiced. Small cabins are fondly recalled and requested. Other urban conveniences such as televisions, videos, or extensive shopping or concessions are largely seen as inappropriate and have the potential to alter the park experience. Some commenters want the return of traditional activities such as downhill skiing and ice skating or reopen campgrounds and reestablish former stores, lodging, or pack horse facilities.**

Most commenters support park interpretive and educational programs and visitor centers and express the desire to expand the programs and personal contact with rangers. Some feel that users should be given more information on appropriate park behavior and expectations and the necessary skills and self-reliance needed in the parks. Most commenters are concerned about the needs of others such as people with disabilities, elderly, or non-English speaking and reading populations. Some commenters want more trails for users with disabilities. Horses are seen by some as one way of providing access for many who could not otherwise see the backcountry. The foothill areas are seen by many as places where additional recreational opportunities such as mountain biking could be provided. Some also propose allowing bicycling in developed areas, the foothills, and as a year-round activity at Cedar Grove. There are divergent views on the relative merits of a reservation systems for campgrounds and Crystal Cave.

A few commenters want to remove all development from the parks and have all users hike in. Some feel that interpretive materials and other information should only be in English. A few feel that surcharges should be levied on non-U.S. citizens.

PARK USERS

Visitor Carrying Capacity

There is substantial interest in the idea of carrying capacity. Visitor carrying capacity deals with balancing acceptable or desired resource conditions, visitor use opportunities, and desired social experiences, and it involves identifying acceptable limits of change to these conditions. For many visitors this concept also deals with the perception of the number of people, crowding, and accompanying resource damage.

Visitor expectation and tolerance of crowding vary. Crowding is affected by the time of day, holidays, seasons, and weather conditions. Tolerance for crowding also relates to the popularity of destinations, their locations, the distances from the road and parking areas, noise levels, and group behavior.

The National Park Service is required to determine the carrying capacity for all its units. The parks will use a decision-making framework that will determine the desired resource conditions, visitor experiences, and use levels that should be maintained in these parks. Full implementation of the carrying capacity concept will require a park monitoring program to ensure that these experiences and conditions are maintained.

Public Viewpoints: Specific comments reveal that most visitors value the beauty and opportunities for quiet and solitude that are provided at Sequoia and Kings Canyon. They desire an experience free from urban congestion and frustrations. They do not want these parks to become crowded like Yosemite or Yellowstone. They want a special park experience free from video stores, road rage, noise, and light pollution. In informal discussion, most people identify the ideal amount of visitors in an area as the size of their own group. Users also understand, for example, that resource damage to sequoia trees is a reason why much of the Giant Forest development is being relocated. Many commenters support the use of limits as a sensible way to maintain the parks resources while providing the experience they want. On the other hand, a few people see any limits as unduly restrictive, unlawful, or bureaucratic.

TRANSPORTATION

Public Viewpoints: Users are concerned about road crowding, the driving experience, and parking availability at destinations. Generally, people recommend setting limits at today's use levels and using transit systems as a way to solve congestion problems. These approaches conform with recent park planning.

On the other hand, a few users feel any controls are un-American. Others feel a transit system would take away from the freedom to enjoy the parks by introducing the urban element of schedules. Some users see unrestricted road access and more parking as the best ways to meet the need. There is some

concern that motion sickness could limit any transit system on the south end of the Generals Highway. Keeping the Generals Highway open is a priority for some, and there are also suggestions to keep Kings Canyon Highway open to Cedar Grove in the winter.

The driving conditions on the twisting Mineral King dirt road is described by some as an adventurous part of the park experience. Many feel that it is beneficial since it controls access by limiting it to the “hardy few.” However, a few users want to upgrade the Mineral King road, widening and paving it.

Other Planning

The Fire Management and Wilderness Management Plans are underway and will be completed before the general management plan is finished. As noted, public input on these plans gathered as part of the GMP process will be forwarded to these efforts. The following summarizes comments the GMP team has received to date.

FIRE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The plan, in the revision stage for it’s five-year cycle, will address specific concerns regarding fire management.

Public Viewpoints: Most comments addressing fire acknowledge it as a natural phenomenon and recognize that former fire-suppression policies resulted in dangerously high levels of forest fuel buildup. Commenters feel that controlled burns and related fire policies are appropriate tools to restore natural conditions. There are opposing viewpoints, however, that see all fire as bad or are concerned about the impact of smoke on gateway communities, the possible impact of fire on park developed zones, or the negative visual impression of burned areas.

WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Thus far the WMP team has used public meetings and workbooks to explore the tradeoffs that result from specific management techniques and options regarding such issues as pack animals, backcountry toilets, trail maintenance methods and party numbers. The wilderness management plan, when completed, will address these concerns.

Public Viewpoints: The majority of comments received by the GMP team deal with the value of wilderness and the controversy of how best to manage the impacts of the traditional use of pack animals. Comments generally support the current backcountry permit system and the carrying capacity work.

Views differ on the appropriateness of all types of pack animal use in the parks. The 1972 park Master Plan, which called for phasing out the use of pack animals, motivates some commenters. [Note: Current policies developed through later wilderness plans seek to manage and limit the impacts of pack animals rather than phase them out.] Commenters also voice the need to retain or remove development or human impacts from some popular areas in the backcountry (Bearpaw Meadow, Pear Lake).

STAYING IN TOUCH WITH THE PLANNING TEAM . . .

General management planning will be completed by 2001. Newsletters will be the main source of information, updates, and announcements about public meetings. Response forms will be included in some newsletters, and workbooks for alternatives development will be available so that you can help us even if you cannot attend meetings. You can stay in touch in the following ways:

- Get on the mailing list for newsletters and other park planning projects by contacting the park GMP coordinator.
- Participate in workshops and meetings.
- Provide comments to the team (When using electronic mail to contact the GMP team, please enter "SEKI GMP" on the subject line and copy both the team captain and park coordinator)
- Visit the internet planning page for the National Park Service and Sequoia and Kings Canyon. These pages will be updated throughout the planning process.

<http://www.nps.gov/planning>

<http://www.nps.gov/seki>

The Sequoia and Kings Canyon GMP Planning Team includes:

Team Captain Susan Spain, DSC-LA

PO Box 25287

Denver, CO 80225-0287

email: susan_spain@nps.gov

Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks

National Park Service

Three Rivers, CA 93271-9700

Park GMP Coordinator

Dr. David Graber, Senior Scientist

email: david_graber@nps.gov

Telephone: (209) 565-3173

Park Superintendent Michael Tollefson

Telephone: (209) 565-3101

Park Public Information Office Kris Fister

Telephone: (209) 565-3131

Note the changing area code for the park: new code is (559) and will be in use beginning November 1998.

You Should Also Know

Transportation Studies

Three transportation studies were undertaken during 1997 and 1998 in the roaded areas of the west side of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. These studies will be used to help determine the visitor traffic loads, bottlenecks, and parking congestion for frontcountry roads and areas. Further transportation background information and the results of these studies will be provided in Newsletter 3.

Giant Forest Area Changes Underway

Giant Forest Lodge and Village: As mentioned in Newsletter 1, a third of the Giant Forest lodging and concession facilities will remain open at the end of 1998. The need for these steps was identified in planning over 20 years ago.

The replacement of these facilities has been carried out in phases since 1984. The project focuses on restoring the Giant Forest sequoia grove and relocating visitor concession facilities to the Wuksachi area. Much of this was mandated by inadequate and leaking sewage treatment facilities, as well as by research indicating damage to the grove by the high level of visitor use and the suppression of fire. Additionally, sequoia trees can occasionally topple without warning, so it made no sense to retain small cabins in this location or to remove the very trees visitors came to see.

Wuksachi Village — This replacement facility for Giant Forest concessions and lodging now has a new concessioner, Delaware North Park Service, Inc. Construction of the replacement visitor lodging has begun. Phase I will include 102 lodging units, expected to be open by summer 1999.

THE DENVER PEOPLE . . .

Many commenters wonder about the role of the Denver specialists in the planning process. Parks typically work with professionals from the NPS Denver Service Center for projects of this magnitude. This permits park management and visitor services to continue uninterrupted while a major planning project is ongoing.

<i>Sequoia and Kings Canyon Joint Planning Schedule</i>			
Public Involvement Dates	General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS)	Wilderness Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (WP/EIS)	Fire Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (FMP/EIS)
Spring 96 Summer 96		In-park scoping Public scoping – 7 cities (California)	
Spring 97 Spring 97 Summer 97		Notice of Intent (EIS) Public scoping	
Fall 97 Winter 97/98	<i>Newsletter 1 / public scoping in park</i> Public scoping regional meetings		
Spring 98 Summer 98		Wilderness workbook – public comment	Public scoping meetings
Fall 98	<i>Newsletter 2</i> <i>Newsletter 3</i> <i>Newsletter 4 – alternatives workbook / alternatives development meetings</i>		
Winter 98/99 Spring 99 Summer 99	<i>Newsletter 5</i>	Draft WP/EIS public comment	Draft FMP/EIS public comment Final FMP/EIS
Fall 99 Winter 99/2000 Spring 2000 Summer 2000	Alternatives newsletter comment period <i>Newsletter 6</i> Draft GMP/EIS public comment period / <i>Newsletter 7</i>	Final WP/EIS	
Fall 2000 Winter 2000/01 Spring 2001	<i>Newsletter 8</i> Final GMP		